

400  
1507

---

Mr. MORGAN's  
ANSWER  
TO  
Mr. M. D'ASSIGNY.

---

1406

MR. MORGAN'S



AN DER

TO

MR. W. D. ASHINGTON

A BRIEF  
ANSWER  
TO

Mr. M. D'Assigny's Book;

Entitled,

*An Antidote against the per-  
nicious Errors of the*  
ANABAPTISTS,  
*or of the* DIPPING-  
SECT.

WHEREIN

His Arguments for Infants Baptism are answered ;  
his disingenuous perverting the Greek Texts,  
discover'd ; his falsifying not only the Sense of  
the Fathers, but also placing them almost an  
Age nearer to our Lord, than it appears from  
the best Chronologers they were, detected : As  
also his unkind Reflections, and scurrilous Lan-  
guage, taken notice of.

In a DIALOGUE.

---

By R. MORGAN. K.

---

*He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved,*  
Mark 16. 16.

---

LONDON, Printed by J. Humfreys, for the Author ;  
and sold by John Baker at Mercers-Chappel. 1708.

# ANSWER TO

Mr. M. D. Wigg's Book;

In Answer to the pre-

vious of the  
SISTERS  
of the BIRPPING  
SECT.



WHILE IN

His Argument for the...  
the...  
discovered; the...  
the...  
As...  
the...  
it's...  
going...

IN A DIALOGUE

By R. H. H. H.

It is...  
1814

Printed by...  
and sold by...



A BRIEF  
ANSWER  
TO

Mr. *M. D'Assigny's* BOOK,

Entitled,

An Antidote against the pernicious Errors of the *Anabaptists*, or of the Dipping-Sect.

*Parish-*  
*oner.* **N**Eighbour, I am glad to see you, and so much the more, because the Minister of our Parish has lately printed a Book against those we commonly call *Anabaptists*, (of whom I suppose you are one) and I shall be glad to have your Opinion on what he has writ, as also hear what you have to say for your selves.

*Anabaptist.* I have seen the Book, and could be glad to see in it a Spirit becoming a Gentleman, a Scholar, or a Christian : But while he can with all that Warmth, (not to say Envy) call us grievous, cruel, and blasphemous Hereticks, Undervaluers of the Spirit of God, and such as are barbarously cruel to our Children ; what shall we say of such a Man, but that he broke through all the Rules of Good Manners, that by that Means he might vent his Gall against us.

*Parish.* I do not like that way of writing, which rather shews the Writers Indignation against his Adversary, than the Justice of the Cause he defends ; and therefore passing that by, if you please, I will read the Arguments which he uses to prove Infants Baptism, and as I go I desire your Opinion.

*Anabapt.* With all my Heart.

*Parish.* Well then, seeing he has laid down in his Book eight Arguments to prove it, let me read them, and do you give your Remarks on them as I go. The First is from Christ's saying, *Suffer little Children to come unto me, &c. Mat. 19. 14. Mark 10. 14. Luke 18. 16.* on which he asks these two Questions, What, were those little Children then brought to Christ?

Secondly,

Secondly, What this Coming to Christ imports? To the first he answers, they were little Infants: To the Second he says, that doubtless it is to be understood of their Admission to his holy Ordinance, which is Baptism.

*Anabapt.* We do not deny that these were Infants, and therefore he might have spared his Learned Criticism on the Text; but we do deny that their Coming to Christ signifies their Admittance to Baptism, and it is to be wonder'd where the Argument of this Proposition lies, viz. Little Children came, or were rather brought to Christ, and blessed by him; therefore Infants are to be baptized: If Baptism and Blessing signify one and the same thing, or if all those that came to him were baptized, then there might be some Argument; but as neither one nor the other is true, a bold Assertion will not convince our Consciences. We do not deny any thing that is either expressed, or may be implied in those Words; but as Infant-Baptism is neither expressed or intended, we must have better Proof before we bring our Infants to that Ordinance. But I wonder why he should tell us, that the Greek Word in Matthew is [προσελθεῖν] *Proselthein*, unless he make no Conscience

to pervert the Word of God, so he may seem to say something to the Purpose, since the Words are [ἐλθεῖν πρὸς μὲ] *Elthein pros me*, to come to me, and not [πρὸς ἐλθεῖν] *Proselthein*; tho if it were, it would be little to his Purpose, unless he could prove that [πρὸς ἐρχομαι] *Proserchomai*, always signifies to profelyte, which he can never do, it being often in Scripture taken in another Sense: Now how disingenuous, as well as sinful, is it, thus to make God's Word speak what we please; may we not suppose that such a Man as this will not stick to add to, or take away from the Word of God in any case, to bear himself out in an Argument. Surely he can never in this case plead Ignorance, and if he did it wittingly, nothing but Repentance will excuse him; for doubtless it is of dreadful Consequence to alter or change the Word of God.

*Parish.* Enough of this: But he further says, *p. 9.* that these Words, *Of such is the Kingdom of Heaven*, are to be understood either of the Kingdom of Grace, or of Glory; if it mean the Kingdom of Grace, Infants can have no Right or Claim to that blessed Kingdom, unless they be brought to, and made Partakers of Baptism.

*Anabapt.* Surely to repeat this, is enough to confute it, while as I think no less can be



be meant, but that Baptism confers Grace, which is not only against the Current of Scripture, but also contrary to the Harmony of Confessions, on which he puts such a Stress in another Case. Surely the Mercy and the Grace of God, with Respect to Infants, was never confin'd to the precarious Will of Man, who, according to this Doctrine, might save or damn his Children as he pleas'd, by bringing them to, or neglecting Baptism : O preposterous Opinion ! Surely all Protestants will disown him here, and detest such an Assertion as this, so derogatory to the Wisdom and Goodness of God.

*Parish.* He says again a little further here, if we understand it of the Kingdom of Glory, and that our Saviour speaks of them as proper Members of that future Happiness, we cannot have the least Pretence to deny them entrance by Baptism into the Kingdom of Grace.

*Anabapt.* This is of the former Stamp, which supposes that Baptism confers Grace, which is a Doctrine indeed held by the Church of *Rome*, but by no Protestant Church in the World as I know of. We rather conclude that this Text is declarative of the Goodness of God to Infants, which Grace no Infant ordain'd of God to



so great a Blessing shall ever loose by any real or suppos'd Neglect of Men; and that if Baptism were intended here, it would have been spoken of, as well as his Blessing them, and laying his Hands on them.

*Parish.* But he says, it is Nonsense to suppose that they should have then been baptiz'd. For Baptism was not a standing Ordinance in the Christian Church, till after the Death of Christ.

*Anabapt.* And I think it is as great Nonsense, to infer Infants Baptism from such a Text as this, spoken to another Purpose, so long before his Death.

*Parish.* He says, *p. 11.* I appeal to our Adversaries, whether this Text is not much more intelligible for Infants Baptism, than God's saying, *I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob*, was to prove the Resurrection of the Body from the Dead, and the real Subsistence of Souls.

*Anabapt.* No; But however, should such a Divine Logician draw the Consequence (as we believe he would not) for Infants Baptism, from the Text in Controversy, we would heartily submit; but, in the mean time, we must have leave to use our own Reason, as well as our Neighbours.

*Parish.*

*Parish.* Let us come to that he calls his 2d Argument, p. 12. which he takes from *Mat. 28. 14. Go ye, and teach all Nations, baptizing them.* And then reciting the Greek, says the true Sense of these Words are, "Disciple, or make Disciples of all Nations, baptizing them, &c.

*Anabapt.* 'Tis a pretty way of arguing, first to pervert a Text, and then to draw from it such Consequences as they please. He would do well to produce some good Author, who uses [μανθάνω] *Manthano*; from whence [μαθητεύσατε] *Matheteusate*, in any other Sense, than to teach or instruct: And I am certain, the Scripture always uses it in that Sense. And as for that canting Term, Disciple, or Disciplize, he would do well to let us know, in plain Words, what he would have us understand by it. I suppose he would have us understand Baptism. But I know no such Sense it has ever born. Indeed it comes of *Disco*, to learn; and so if it signify any thing, it signifies, to cause them to learn by instructing, like the Verb from whence it comes. But because he and some of his Brethren are so fond of this new devised Word, hoping to hook in Baptism, I will read you one Text, where it plainly appears, *to make Disciples*, has a quite different

rent Sense from *Baptism*; *John* 4. 1. (Ἰησοῦς πλείονας μαθητὰς ποιεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει ἢ Ἰωάννης) *Jesus made and baptized more Disciples than John*. I suppose he himself will allow, that whatever is here meant by making Disciples, it does not mean *Baptism*; and let him shew where it does, or for the future forbear to urge it. And I think it will not much help his Interpretation, that the word [διδασκόντες] *Teaching*, follows [βαπτίζοντες] *Baptizing*, which shews indeed, that *Teaching* was intended as well to build up and establish the Baptized, as to instruct the Unbaptized, but cannot help his Cause. \* *Irenaeus* says, How had *Christ* Disciples, if he did not teach them: And so say I, in this Case, how can they be Disciples, *i. e.* Scholars, if they are not taught? I think it is evident from what this Father says, That they had not then found out the way to make Disciples, without teaching, as Men pretend to now.

*Parish*. As to his third Argument, I don't know what to make of it. Pray do you read it, and see if you can come at his Meaning.

---

\* Quomodo enim habuit discipulos, si non docebat?  
*Iren. adv. h. 4. ref. Lib. 2. Chap. 39.*

*Anabapt.* Truly there are a great heap of Words to a very small Degree of Sense; but if there be any Meaning in them, I think he intends to advance Infants Baptism, on that old thread-bare Argument of Baptism's coming in the room and stead of Circumcision: Which if it doth, does it at all follow that it must have the same Subjects, any more than that it should be the same thing. The New Covenant is said to come in the room and stead of the Old, to which belongs Circumcision; and yet we must not argue, that therefore the New Covenant is a Covenant of Works, because it follows that which was so: And yet so to argue, is of the same Force, as to argue from Circumcision to Baptism. But tho they urge this as an Argument in this Case, they will not admit it in another. Who is it that does not know, that the Lord's Supper succeeded the Paschal Lamb, as much as Baptism does to Circumcision? And is it not as well known, that Infants did partake of the Lamb? Why then do they not bring them to the Lord's Table, as some of the Fathers did? If the Argument be good when it is for them, surely it must be so when against them. Therefore if they will bring their Infants to Baptism on this foot, let them bring them also  
to



to the Lord's Table: And if not, let them forbear both, with us, till they can answer for themselves. For whatsoever can be said for Infants Baptism from Circumcision, the same may be said for Infants Communion from the Passover. This is an Objection against them, which has not, as I know of, ever been answered to any Purpose. From what has been said, I think it plainly appears, that Old-Testament Institutions, or Ordinances, cannot bind, nor be a Rule or Measure to us under the New, unless it have a Command to enforce it. Nay, so necessary is the Command of God, to enjoin any thing to be perform'd as Service to him, that whatsoever is brought into the Church under that Pretence, and wants it, becomes a Sin. For should *Abraham* have circumcised himself, and his Males, without that Command which he had, it would have been his Sin, as coming under the Denomination of Will-Worship. I shall pass by all the other Tattle of those Pages, as not worth Notice, and therefore pray do you read the next Argument.

*Parish.* His Fourth Argument he draws from 1 Cor. 7. 14. where 'tis said, *the unbelieving Husband is sanctified by the Wife, &c. else were your Children unclean, but now are they holy*; which Holiness he pretends gives them a Right to Baptism. *Ana-*



*Anabapt.* What Holiness soever is meant in this Text, I think Baptism of Infants can't be inferr'd from thence ; for at that rate of arguing, if either a Husband or a Wife be a Believer, then it gives a Right not only to the Infants of such a Believer, but also to the unbelieving Husband or Wife, and all their adult Children, tho' they are Infidels, (for it may as well be understood of them as Infants) which is an Absurdity that they themselves will be asham'd of.

*Parish.* His Fifth Argument is drawn from the Baptism of whole Households ; but this Argument he confesseth to have no Force ; “ For, says he, because Infants are not here expressly named, we shall not insist on this Argument ; for our Adversaries may as boldly deny little Children to be there, as we may suppose, and confidently affirm, that in so many Houses they could not be all of ripe Years. So, if you please, we will proceed to his Sixth, taken from *Acts 2. 39.* being Peter's Words to the Jews, when they cry out, *Men and Brethren, what shall we do?* He says to them, *Repent, and be baptized every one of you, &c. for the Promise is to you, and to your Children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord your God shall call.*

*Anabapt.*

*Anabapt.* Whatever Promises God made with *Israel*, it is certain, that the Promise which *St. Peter* says *was to them and to their Children*, &c. in this Place, was no other but the Promise of the Holy Ghost, of which he speaks, *ver. 33.* and repeats again, *ver. 38, 39.* But granting it was a Promise of Life and Salvation, as he would have it, (which may not be granted) where is Infants Baptism? If it be said, that all to whom this Promise was made are call'd upon to be baptiz'd, so were they call'd on to repent, which I suppose he will not say they are capable of; and if they must defer Repentance till a proper time, so let them do their Baptism, till they can act Faith, which, according to the Scripture, and the Doctrine of the Church of † *England*, is necessary thereto; but because I think this is a sufficient Answer to this Argument, looking on what he says further on it, as little to the Purpose, I desire you would read his next.

*Parish.* His 7<sup>th</sup> is a kind of Question, for he says, " I intreat our Anti-pædo-  
" Baptists to tell me by what Method  
" they can propose to obtain or procure  
" Salvation to their Infants dying before

---

† *Catechism of the Church of England.*

“ they come to riper Years, otherwise  
 “ than by Baptism.

*Anabapt.* I suppose he here asks a Question for himself, and it needs no Answer but for the sake of those of the Church of Rome, who like himself teach that Baptism confers Grace, for his own Church is of another Mind. But, 1<sup>st</sup>. If Baptism did confer Grace, *ex opere operato*, then *Simon Magus* would have had Grace, which is evident he had not. The Church of England says, the Sacraments are *outward and visible Signs of inward and spiritual Grace*, and therefore not the Grace it self, nor are they necessarily the Conveyers of Grace to the Soul, but only Signs of that Grace, which is wrought in the Soul by the Spirit of God; and therefore Baptism saves us by the Answer of a good Conscience toward God, and not by the washing of the Flesh, not *ex opere operato*. But, 2<sup>dly</sup>. The present Question seems to be, That seeing all Mankind are born in Original Sin, how can this be taken away from Infants, without Baptism? To which the Answer is at hand, Let him who hath said, *Of such is the Kingdom*, do with them as he pleases, seeing he has declared his gracious Intention towards them, with Respect to Salvation; let the Blood  
 of

of Christ, which cleanseth from all Sin, cleanse them from this Sin of Nature, and let God apply Pardon to them in his own way ; and seeing it is not likely that he should venture their Salvation on so precarious a thing as Baptism, which may, or may not be administred, according to the various Humours of Men, ( as I said before ) and a hundred other Accidents that may occur ; and seeing we have no Warrant from the Word of God to baptize them to this End, let us rest satisfied in the Goodness of God, whose Grace is infinite, and whose Thoughts are not as ours, and not provoke God by seeking Salvation for them, in a way which he never appointed ; and whereas he says, that St. *Peter* has declar'd, that Baptism was ordain'd for the Remission of Sin, he has mistaken the Place, for St. *Peter* joins Repentance and Baptism together, as requir'd in order to the Remission of Sins ; and therefore this Text cannot shew any Necessity of Baptism to Infants, in order to the Remission of Sins, because they cannot repent.

*Parish.* His Eighth and Last Argument is taken from the Words of Christ to *Nicodemus*, John 3. 5. *Except a Man be born of Water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the*



*the Kingdom of God.* From whence he would infer the Necessity of Infants Baptism.

*Anabapt.* In answer to this Argument I shall give you the Comment of a Learned Man on the Words: 1. Says he, † “ It is “ strange that when all agree that the “ Birth spoken of here is spiritual and me- “ taphorical, that the Water here should “ be natural. 2. None could be saved “ unless baptized, if this were meant of “ Baptism. As if these Words, *John 6.* “ *53. Except you eat the Flesh of the Son of* “ *Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no* “ *Life in you,* were meant of the Supper, “ none could be saved unless they did par- “ take of it: Whereas Christ lays not the “ stress upon Baptism, but upon Faith, “ *Mark 16. 16. He that believeth and is* “ *baptized shall be saved, but he that belie-* “ *ueth not shall be damned.* 3. Baptism “ was not then a standing \* Sacrament in “ the Christian Church.—And it is not “ likely Christ would discourse of an In- “ stitution that was not yet expressly ap- “ pointed by him. A little further, Those “ that understand it of Baptismal Water, “ and so make it of absolute Necessity,

---

† Charnock's *Sermon on John 3. 5.*

\* This M. D'Allignay also confesseth, P. 11.



do by another Assertion accuse their  
 own Exposition of Falsity, for they say,  
 that the Baptism of Blood (*i. e.* Mar-  
 tyrdom) supply the want of Water.  
 'Tis Water that is expressed, and Blood  
 is not Water. One of these Assertions  
 must be false.

'Tis certain that Water is often in Scrip-  
 ture taken for the renewing, cleansing and  
 refreshing Operations of the Holy Spirit;  
 and I think there is all the Reason in the  
 World to take it in some of these Senses  
 in this Place, especially if we consider *Mat.*  
*3. 11.* where Christ is said to come to bap-  
 tize *with the Holy Ghost, and with Fire.* Now  
 nothing can be meant here, but the puri-  
 fying Operations of the Divine Spirit:  
 Now for a Reason why that of *John 3.*  
 may not be understood in this manner,  
 there must be something more advanced  
 than has yet been.

*Parish.* But I find here, *p. 29.* some-  
 thing which seems both new and strange:  
 However (says he) as the Intent of  
 Baptism was to enter us into a State of  
 Grace, and seal to us the Pardon of our  
 Sins, and a Title to the Divine Favour,  
 it may with a great deal of Reason be  
 stiled a New-Birth, without any Regard  
 to the Birth of the Spirit.

*Anabapt.* The good Lord deliver us from such Expositors and Divines, who can find so much Reason for things not only ridiculous, but so contrary to Scripture as this is.

*Parish.* As to the two next Sections, I suppose you do not much account your selves concern'd, it not immediately concerning the Controversy.

*Anabapt.* True, but this I would say with regard to Sureties at Baptism (as they are called) he makes a very learned Dis- cant, while he gives us their Names in six or seven Languages, I suppose he did it that the World might know that he had Knowledge in so many Tongues, for otherwise I can't imagine to what purpose he does it.

*Parish.* Well, we will read what he says of the word Baptism, p. 46, &c.

*Anabapt.* I can't imagine what he means when he says of [βαπτίζω] *Baptizo*, that its natural Signification may imply a lesser Dipping; but it may be a Discovery that no body else has made, and therefore we will wait for his own Explication, for I know no Greek Author that uses the Word in any other Sense than to *dip* or *plunge*, and so to wash by such Dipping. But as to what he says on *Mark* 7. 4. That to baptize

signifies any kind of Washing, Sprinkling, or Cleansing, where there is no Dipping, and that it is ridiculous to fancy that they were so often dipt or plung'd into the Water over Head and Ears.

I suppose those that are a little versed in the Jewish Antiquities, and consider the Country where they lived, will not think it so ridiculous as *M. D.* would insinuate. But for answer to this, hear what *Beza* and *Pool* say on the Place. \* Now (says *Beza*) *ῥανγιδω*, in this Place, is more than *ῥεβρίσκειν*, because the former signifies to wash the whole Body, the latter is to be understood of the Hands only; neither does *ῥο βαρυνειν* signify to wash, except by Consequence, for it properly denotes to immerse for Dipping-sake. And to prove this Sense of the Word, he brings divers Greek Authors. *Pool* in his *Synop. Crit.* says, † “They were careful in pur-

---

*ῥο* *ῥανγιδω* hoc in loco quam *ῥεβρίσκειν* quod illud videatur de corpore universo, istud de manibus duntaxat intelligendum. Neque verò *ῥο βαρυνειν*, significat lavare, nisi consequenti, nam proprie declarat Diligenti causa immergere, &c. *Beza in loco.*

† Majori Cura se purgabant a fori contactu, quippe non tantum lavando, quod est *ῥεβρίσκειν*, sed & corpus immerendo quod est *ῥο βαρυνειν*. — Cum verò hic mos apud omnes ferme Judæos receptus fuerit. *Pol. Synop. Crit. in loc.*

'ging themselves from the Defilements of  
 ' the Market, which was done not only  
 ' by washing the Hands, which is *καὶ πλύνει*,  
 ' but by dipping the Body, which is *βαπτίζου*  
 ' *καὶ τοὺς πόδας*-- and this Custom was receiv'd  
 ' by almost all the Jews. As to what he  
 says of washing Cups, Pots, Brass Vessels,  
 and Tables, or Beds, there is nothing of  
 Difficulty in these Words, with respect to  
 Dipping, but what is urged from *καλῶν*,  
 which signifies, of Beds or Tables: Now  
 it is evident enough, and consented to on  
 all Sides, that they were not Beds which  
 they reposed themselves on at Night, but  
 a sort of Seats which they set on at Feasts;  
 and sometimes the Word signifies the Tables  
 themselves, on which they fed; and of these  
 Tables our *English* Translators understood  
 the Word in this Place, as you may see by  
 their turning it so; but which doever is  
 here to be understood, it is easy to con-  
 ceive it convenient enough to dip them,  
 since, according to their Law, such kind  
 of washing were commanded, and they  
 had need enough of it too, if they did eat  
 their Meat on them, as he says they did,  
 p. 47. As to what he says, from the Me-  
 taphorical Baptisms of the Spirit, and of  
 Affliction, they make nothing to his Pur-  
 pose, till Metaphors justly and naturally



agree to the things from whence they are taken, and then Christ shall be a *Vine*, a *Rock*, a *Lamb*, &c. indeed, and a Man shall be a *Shadow*, a *Flower*, a *Wolf*, a *Dog*, &c. As to what he says on *Luke* 11. 38. that there was no Dipping. Neither was there any Water, so that it may as well be brought against Baptism it self, as against Dipping. From what has been said on *Mark* 7. 4. (not to speak of his false *Greek*) it is easy to imagine, that on many Occasions they immers'd themselves before they eat, from the Defilements of the Forum, and other that they might attract by being abroad, for here is no mention of Hands. As to the divers Washings or Baptisms, mention'd *Heb.* 9. 10. it is a Place which Learned Men are not well agreed how it does accord with what goes before; but as to this Controversy, it is evident enough, that the [*διαφοροῖς βαπτισμοῖς*,] *diaphorois baptismois*, divers Baptisms here spoken of, were divers Dippings, as the Words signify, and the Washings under the Law do evince; for many of their Washings were such, as require the washing or bathing the whole Body, as *Lev.* 15, &c. & 17. 15. and several other Places, which might be referr'd to, and not Sprinkling, as he has dis-



disingeniously infer'd from *Lev. 14. 6, 7.* and *Numb. 19. 18.* for in the 13th Verse of this Chapter, where he would have us understand Sprinkling, he uses a Word proper to that Purpose, (*i. e. βαπτίζω* *res. νεκρωσιν*,) *Sprinkling the unclean.* And whereas he says, *pp. 49.* that he can bring many Quotations out of *Greek Authors*, to prove his Sense of the Word, I desire he would give us but one or two, to prove that *βαπτίζω* signifies to sprinkle. But in the mean while having answer'd all he says for Sprinkling, I think it will not be amiss, to refer you to \* what the late Archbishop of York says, ' Whenever a Person (in ancient Times) was baptized, he was not only to profess his Faith in Christ's Death and Resurrection, but he was also to look upon himself as oblig'd, in Correspondence therewith, to mortify his former carnal Affections, and to enter upon a new State of Life: And the very Form of Baptism did lively represent this Obligation to them; for what did their being plunged under Water signify, but their undertaking, in Imitation of Christ's Death and Burial,

*Several Persons among us of fifty or seventy Years old of both Sexes*  
 \* *Sermon before Queen Mary, March 27. 1692.*

‘ to forsake their evil Courses, as their  
 ‘ Ascending out of the Water did their  
 ‘ Engagement to lead a new Life. Thus  
 much and more to this Purpose you have  
 from the Archbishop, which shews, at least,  
 that it was this great Man’s Mind that the  
 primitive Church did baptize Believers as  
 we do by plunging them. If Mr. D.  
 can shew from good Authors, ( which I  
 know he cannot ) that it signifies to sprin-  
 kle, we are willing to submit. But be-  
 cause I would not detain you too long, I  
 refer you to what the Learned and Judi-  
 cious Mr. Stennet has said on this Word,  
 in answer to Mr. Russen’s 90<sup>th</sup> Chapter.

As to what he says of the Sign of the Cross  
 in Baptism, he himself does not pretend that  
 it is founded on the Word of God, or that  
 it is necessary to Baptism, and therefore  
 can be of no Force to bind the Consciences  
 of those, who declare the Scripture to be  
 the only Rule of Faith.

Paris/b. Well then, if you please, I de-  
 sire you to answer what he says from An-  
 tiquity : And, *as* He tells us, that *Justin*  
*Martyr*, who liv’d in the next Age to the  
 Apostles, in his Apology for the Christians,  
 has these Words, ‘ Several Persons among  
 ‘ us of sixty or seventy Years old, of both  
 ‘ Sexes, who were discipled to Christ in  
 ‘ their

their Childhood, continue uncorrupted; from whence he infers, that Infants were baptized so soon after Christ. *Arg. A. Henry*  
*Anabapt.* He has miserably mistaken the Sense of the Martyr; for he is † there speaking of Adultery and Fornication, and that those, of whom he speaks, who were instructed or taught Christ from their Youth, (for so *ἐκ παιδός* signifies, which is the Words the Martyr uses) had kept themselves uncorrupted. But to shew that these Words do not imply what he would have them, I will instance 2 *Tim.* 3. 15. where a Word is used, that he himself says signifies Infants, and yet in this manner of speaking signifies no more, but that *Timothy* knew the Scriptures betimes, or from the first use of Reason: and we do teach our Children that they may know God and Christ from their Childhood, and when they are able to make Profession of their Faith, we no longer keep them from Baptism, if they desire it. And I think it is very evident that the Martyr means that they had learnt Christ from their Youth; for if [*ἐκ παιδός*] *apo* *βροχίους* signify in the fore-cited Place, from a Child, i. e. from the time that he was capable to understand, how

---

† *Apol.* 2. *Par.* Edit. *Fol.* p. 62. || *Arg. B. Henry.*

much more must [*ἐκ παιδων*] *ec* *paidon*, which is a Word that signifies a more advanc'd Age. As to the Word which he translates to disciple, it being the same that is used, *Mat.* 28. 19. I refer you to what I said on that.

*Parish.* Well, but he cites *Irenaus*, who liv'd very near the Apostles Time, speaking thus : \* ' He came to save all Persons by himself; all, I mean, who by him are regenerated to God, Infants and Little Ones, Youths and Elder Persons.

*Anabapt.* I profess Men seem to be driven to hard shifts to support a Cause, when they are forc'd to bring such Places as these; for all that he can pretend to from hence is, that the Word Regenerate is by the Fathers used sometimes to signify Baptism, therefore it is so to be understood here: A worthy Argument indeed! when, where it is once used in that Sense, it is used many times for the Work of Regeneration. But if he please to read this Chapter in *Irenaus*, I think it will appear he knew nothing of making Infants Disciples by Baptism without teaching, that is, that he knew nothing of Infants Baptism, for a little lower he says, (*Quomodo*

---

\* *Irenaeus* adv. *Her.* 1. 2. c. 39.



*enim habuit discipulos, si non docebat?* ) How had [Christ] Disciples, if he did not teach? And indeed, the very Scope and Intent of the Chapter, as well as these Words, proves, that he does not mean Baptism, but the Salvation of Persons of all Ages, who by the Spirit of Christ were new-born.

*Parish.* But he says in the same Place, that *Origin*, who liv'd in a Church founded by St. *Peter*, about thirty five Years after the Apostles, was for Infants Bap-

*Anabapt.* Surely this Man thought he might impose what he would on the *Anabaptists*, or else he is very ignorant of Antiquity himself. Indeed, I would be so charitable as to think that his Author deceiv'd him; for I believe all his Quotations are at second Hand, and that he has not read the Fathers himself. But as to *Origin*, if it be true what he says of him, he was in the Church about Fifty Years before he was born; for, according to *Dacryus*, he was not born till about the Year 185. whose Authority in that Case, will, as I believe, go as far as his; and *Baronius* calls him a Youth in the Year 208. What such a Man can mean by advancing such manifest Falshood, I know not; but it seems to be all of a Piece with his falsifying the Original, in his Quotation of Scripture.

*Parish.*

*Parish.* Who is this *Platina* he quotes, saying, *Higmas* speaks of Infants Baptism in the Days of *Polycarp*, Disciple to *St. John*?

*Anabapt.* He was a Roman Catholick, whom he himself in many other Cases will not believe: and I think he who is not to be believ'd in one thing, is not much to be credited in another, except there be others who affirm the same thing; but in this Case, no Writings of those times do affirm it, but are altogether silent: Now how he should come to the Knowledge of that, which no body else can find, is a Mystery. And if *Platina* had nothing but the Tradition of his Church to ground it upon, let him that will believe it; and then he is in a fair way to believe all the other Trash of the *Romish* Church.

*Parish.* But he says in the same Page, that *St. Cyprian*, about one hundred and fifty Years after Christ, said, that Baptism was not to be deny'd to Infants, &c. in a Letter to *Fidas*.

*Anabapt.* With what Face this Man can affirm these things, I know not, but it is certain that here is a Mistake of about an hundred Years; for *Baronius* says he

\* *C. Cyprianus summo Clero & Populi consensu Ecclesie Carthaginensis Episcopus eligitur. Bar. An. 250.*

was

was chosen Bishop of Carthage in the Year 250. and † *Du Pin* says that this Choice was in the Year 248. Now which soever of these is true, it is near a hundred Years mistake, there being no Reason to doubt but this Epistle was written after he was made Bishop. Perhaps this is a small matter with him, but if an Anabaptist had done it, he must have expected no Quarter.

As to what these Fathers say of Infants Baptism, it was not spoken till above 200 Years after Christ, as appears by what I have said, and not one word of it before: *Tertullian*, who flourish'd in the third Century, is the first that speaks of it, and he speaks against it; his Words are these: '|| According to every ones Condition and Age too, 'tis more useful to delay Baptism, and especially as to little Children.

† *Du Pin* Eccl. Hist.

|| Pro cuiusque Personæ conditione ac dispositione etiam ætate cunctatio baptismi utilior est; præcipue tamen circa parvulos — Ait quidem Dominus, *Nolite illos prohibere ad me venire.* Veniant ergo dum adolescunt, veniant dum discunt, dum quo veniant docentur; si hæc Christiani quum Christum nosse potuerint. Quid festinat innocens ætas ad remissionem Peccatorum? Cautius agatur in secularibus; ac ubi substantia terrena non creditur, divina credatur. Norint petere salutem ut petenti deditisse videaris. *Tertul.* *de Bapt.* l. 2. c. 18.

“ Indeed

' indeed our Lord says, *Forbid them not to*  
 ' *come to me*: Therefore let them come  
 ' when they grow up, let them come  
 ' when they learn, when they are taught  
 ' whither to come, let them become Chri-  
 ' stians when they are able to know Christ,  
 ' why does that innocent Age hasten to  
 ' the Remission of Sins? Men act more  
 ' cautiously in Secular Affairs, for this is  
 ' to commit a Divine Treasure to such as  
 ' are not entrusted with an earthly Estate.  
 ' Let 'em first know how to desire Salvati-  
 ' on, that you may appear to have given  
 ' to him that asks. And it is well known  
 that several other Errors as well as Infants  
 Baptism crept into the Church in the third  
 Century; such as Anointing the Baptized  
 with Oyl; Dipping them thrice, &c. so  
 that we need not wonder so much at its  
 Antiquity. The pure and Apostolick Age  
 knew nothing of it. *Justin Martyr* in his  
 first Apology, which according to *Dr. Cave*  
 was written about the Year 150. speaking  
 of Baptism, says, \* ' Whosoever are per-

\* Ὅσοι ἀν' παιδῶν καὶ πιστῶν αὐτῶν ἀληθῆ ταῦτα τὰ ἐρ' ἡμῶν  
 διδασκόμενα καὶ λεγόμενα εἶναι καὶ εἶναι ἕως διναδῶν ὑπὸ  
 τῶντα εὐχαδαί τε καὶ αἰτῶν γητεύοντες παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ τῶν προ-  
 μαρτυμένων ἀφῆσαν διδασκονται ἡμῶν συνευχαμένων καὶ συνη-  
 σιόντων αὐτοῖς· ἐπεὶ ταῦτα ἄγονται ὑπὸ ἡμῶν ἐνθα ὑμεῖς ἐστέ—

.Apolog. prima Edita à Joanne Ernesto Grabe Oxon. 1700.  
 p. 115, 116.

' swaded



'swaded and believe that those things  
 'which are taught and spoken by us, are  
 'true, and receive them, promising to  
 'live agreeable thereto, they are taught to  
 'pray and fasting, to beg of God the Re-  
 'mission of their former Sins, we both  
 'praying and fasting with them. After  
 'that they are brought where there is  
 'Water, &c. Here we see the Martyr  
 wide enough from speaking any thing of  
 Infants Baptism, who no doubt would  
 have made mention of it at this favourable  
 Opportunity, had it been at that time a  
 received Article of the Church's Faith.  
 What remains but that I tell you, that In-  
 fants Baptism seems not to have been ge-  
 nerally received till the third Century was  
 well advanced, if so soon. I have not  
 time now to speak to the rest of the Quo-  
 tations which he brings, nor need I, be-  
 cause they all refer to a later Date, that is,  
 to the third and fourth Centuries, at  
 which time we confess Infant-Baptism to  
 have been in being. I also hope to see a  
 compleat History of Baptism done by a  
 learned and judicious Hand, which makes  
 me with the more Satisfaction forbear.  
 I think also he might well have spared  
 himself the Labour of bringing so many  
 of the Protestant Churches against us.

We

We are very unwilling to dissent from our Brethren, but we dare not forgo the Truth. If the Multitude of our Opposers be any Sign of a good Cause, I persuade my self that the Heathens, Turks or Papists, may plead for their Superstitions with too much Advantage over us both. And perhaps I could shew that most of these Protestant Churches which he quotes against us, are against the Diocesan Bishops of his Church. And yet I believe he does not think this is a convincing Argument against them. And therefore I pray him to give the same Liberty he takes.

*Parish.* I think you need not make any Remarks on what he says to the Objections, because you have done that in your Answer to his Argument.

*Anabapt.* But there are some things must not go without a Remark. First he says, p. 109. 'We have not falsified the Records, nor mangled the Quotations, as (*Danvers* and *Tombs*) some of our Adversaries have done. I think he ought not to bring himself in among those that don't falsifie and mangle it, for if Mr. *Danvers* or Mr. *Tombs* either, whom he is pleased to asperse, had been as guilty as himself in that respect,

spect, we would have been ashamed of them.

Again, p. 114. He oddly insinuates that we don't baptize in the Name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, but in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ only. Let all who have seen and heard the manner of our Administration of that sacred Ordinance, witness for us, that it is a Falsity unworthy the Pen of a Gentleman, and much more of Christian.

*Parish.* I see here he has one Section he entitleth, Of Rebaptization, pray give me some account of that matter as it concerns you.

*Anabapt.* We do with all our Hearts abhor Rebaptization or Anabaptism, but we believe that that which Infants receive in Infancy, is not Baptism, but a Nullity, because there is an Error both in Subject and Mode, and so when they come and make Profession of their Faith, we baptize them according to Christ's Institution; and besides, the Nature of the thing it self, we have for this the Authority of St. *Cyprian*, and with him above seventy Bishops met in the 2<sup>d</sup> and 3<sup>d</sup> Councils of *Carthage*, affirming that where the Baptism is null, there it ought to be

reiterated: *Dionysius Alexandrinus* also, and *Fermilian*, Bishop of *Casarea* in *Capadocia*, and a great many others in the East, were of *St. Cyprian's* Mind. And though we don't build our Faith on any Councils, but on the Word of God, yet this may be observed, that that which Men now call Anabaptism, has not always appear'd such a Monster.

*Parish.* But he says, 'Such as teach among you are Tallow-Chandlers, Pedlars, Tinkers, Taylors, Tinmen, &c. of whom he says, he dares say of some of them, that they understand not their Catechism, nor the Grounds of Religion, p. 139, & 141.

*Answer.* Those that read his Book would think he himself talks more like a Catechumen than a Catechist; but to wipe off the Slander he intends us by this, as if we had no Order or Rule among us, I'll take leave to inform you, We have among us Men of good Learning; and others, if they have not so great a Degree of Literature, our Churches take care to let none preach but those who understand the Word of God, and the Grounds of Religion well; and if there be any who run before



before they are sent, we own them not. But as to their being Men who have, or do follow secular Employments, we believe that those who preach the Word of God ought to devote themselves as much as may be to that great Work; and that they ought to be maintain'd: But if the Poverty of the People they preach to will not afford them what is requisite, it is no Dishonour to labour like *Paul* with their Hands. Some as great Men as the World has known, have been Mechanics. Who among the Heathen Philosophers was greater than *Epictetus* the Slave, and what an honourable Character does *Dr. Cave* \* give of *Ammonius*, who says he was called *Sacas* (from his carrying of Sacks of Corn on his Back, being a Porter by Employment, before he betook himself to the Study of Philosophy) one of the most learned and eloquent Men of those Times, a great Philosopher; and which was aboveall, a Christian. It were easy to give many Instances to this purpose, beside that of the Disciples of our Lord, but let this suffice; and I may note, that as all with us are not unlear-

---

\* *Dr. Cave in the Life of Origin.*

ned, so all with them who put on the Gown, are not learned.

And now to put an end to our Conference at this time, you see how little regard he has had to the Truth, or to good Manners, while he has committed such Errors against Scripture and Antiquity on one hand, and by his scurrilous and unbecoming Language on the other, broke through all the Rules of Modesty. I believe he would think it ill Manners, if by changing the Terms I should conclude in his own Words, *p.* 68. ' If they (says he, ' speaking of the Anabaptists) or any of ' our Church, or any other Men reputed ' for Learning, have been mistaken and ' drawn into an Errour in this Case, by ' trusting too much upon the Allegations ' of others who have been before them ' deceived, or who have design'd to impose upon the ignorant World, it is no ' Prejudice to our Cause, but a betraying ' of their own Weakness, in that they ' cannot maintain their Errour, but by ' learning the Devil's Art to support all ' Heresies and false Doctrines. Now let those that read his Book, judge who has made most use of that he calls *the Devil's Art*, he or we. Neighbour, I think his Zeal,

Zeal, or rather his Prejudice, has very much blinded him, or else he would not have thus run headlong into those Errours that he would fain fasten on others, and I would desire him another time to take the Beam out of his own Eye before he seeks to pluck the Mote out of his Brother's. 'Tis easy to darken Knowledge by Words without Understanding. A thing is neither true nor false, because this or that Church believes it, or because this or that Man affirms it, but it consists in the Nature of the things themselves, we are not to be frightened out of a Truth with Bounce and Bluster. 'Tis not his crying out, Heresy, Schism, Cruelty, Ignorance, &c. will scare us from Truth; we have the Word of God as well as the best Antiquity on our side, and therefore hard Words without hard Arguments, are not like to have any great Effect on us, how ignorant soever he may suppose us to be.

*F I N I S.*

Yes, or rather his blindness, has  
much blinded him, or else he would not  
have this run headlong into these errors  
that he would fall, fallen on others, and  
I would desire him another time to take  
the Beam out of his own eye before he  
looks to pluck the Afore out of his  
neighbour's. 'Tis easy to darken Knowledge  
by Words without Understanding. A  
thing is neither true nor false, because this  
or that Church believes it, or because this  
or that Man affirms it, but it consists in  
the Nature of the things themselves, we  
are not to be frighted out of a Truth with  
Rhetoric and Bluster. 'Tis not his crying  
out, Heresy, Schism, Condemnation, Ignorance,  
&c. will scare us; we have  
the Word of God as well as the beliers.  
ridicule our own side, and therefore hard  
words without hard Arguments, are not  
like to have any great effect on us, nor  
ignominy show any influence on us.

W. V. 2.